1 2 3 4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS WESTERN SECTION
5	
6	BLACKSTONE MEDICAL, INC . No. 08cv30145-map
7	v. .
8	OSIRIS THERAPEUTICS, INC
9	v
10	NuVASIVE .
11	
12	
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. PONSOR,
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, MOTION HEARING
15	JULY 24, 2008.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	APPEARANCES:
21	See mare 2
22	See page 2.
23	
24	
25	
I	

1	APPEARANCES:
2	For the plaintiff by telephone: Brian Hurst, 2001 Ross Ave., Suite 2300, Dallas, TX 75201.
3	
4 5	J. Brent Alldredge and W. Barton Rankin, 2300 Trammel Crow Center, 2001 Ross Ave., Dallas, TX 75201.
6	For the plaintiff in person: John Pucci and J. Lizette Richards, 64 Gothic Street, Suite 4, Northampton, MA 01060
7	
8	
9	For the defendant Osiris by telephone: James Dillon, 155
10	Seaport Boulevard, Boston, MA 02210-2600.
11	Tami Lyn Azorsky, 1900 K. Street, N.W., Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 2006-1108.
12	
13	For the defendant NuVasive by telephone: Bruce Falby and Jason Hannon, 33 Arch Street, 26th Floor,
14	Boston, MA 02110-1447.
15	
16	
17	Alice Moran, CSR, RPR, RMR Official Federal Court Reporter
18	1550 Main Street, Room 536 Springfield, MA 01103
19	Tel: (413)731-0086 Fax: (413)737-7333 <u>alice.moran@verizon.net</u>
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 (Court commenced at 2:13.) 2 3 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated. 4 THE CLERK: This is the case of Blackstone 5 Medical versus Osiris Therapeutics, Civil Action 08-30145. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. What I'm going to do 8 first is have counsel introduce themselves. I am 9 speaking a little louder than I normally do because I'm 10 hoping that our friends who are listening in by telephone 11 will be able to hear what I'm saying, and I'm going to 12 ask the people who are here by telephone to speak up a 13 bit as well because it may be hard for us to hear you in 14 the courtroom. 15 Here in the courtroom with me I have -- well, I'll 16 let counsel introduce themselves here and tell me who 17 they're representing. 18 MR. PUCCI: John Pucci, Your Honor, for 19 Blackstone Medical. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MS. RICHARDS: Lizette Richards also for 22 Blackstone Medical. 23 THE COURT: And how do you spell your last 24 name? 25 MS. RICHARDS: It's R-I-C-H-A-R-D-S.

1	THE COURT: All right. Were you able to hear
2	that, those of you who are on the phone?
3	MR. DILLON: No, Your Honor, we were not. This
4	is James Dillon from Foley Hoag and I could not hear. I
5	could hear you fine.
6	THE COURT: Right. One of the problems that I
7	will tell you all this with my system here is it is hard
8	for people on the other end of the line to hear people in
9	the courtroom. So I'm going to ask Mr. Pucci to come up
10	a little closer to the telephone and we'll see if we
11	can't manage this a little better with him closer.
12	I understand that I have on the line right now Mr.
13	Dillon from Foley, Hoag, is that correct?
14	MR. DILLON: That is correct, here for the
15	defendant Osiris Therapeutics.
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	MR. DILLON: And with me on the phone is Tami
18	Azorsky from McKenna Ling & Aldridge in Washington, D.C.
19	There is a motion pro hac vice filed to enter her
20	appearance in this case to which I have said there's no
21	objection.
22	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Azorsky, can you
23	spell your last name please?
24	MS. AZORSKY: Yes, it's A-Z-O-R-S-K-Y.
25	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

1 I also understand that we have Mr. Hurst with us, is 2 that right? 3 MR. HURST: That's correct, Your Honor, as well 4 my co-counsel here at Baker & McKenzie, Brent Alldredge, 5 A-L-L-D-R-E-D-G-E, and Bart Rankin, R-A-N-K-I-N. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And I also understand we 7 have Bruce Falby joining us? 8 MR. FALBY: Yes, Your Honor, Bruce Falby; F, as 9 in Frank, A-L-B as in boy, Y, DLA Piper in Boston. I 10 represent NuVasive, Inc., the purchaser under the 11 transaction that you've been asked to enjoin, and with me 12 is Jason Hannon, H-A-N-N-O-N. He's not with me 13 physically but also on the phone with us. He's the 14 general counsel of NuVasive and we had planned to attend 15 any live hearing or attending. 16 I had prepared a motion to intervene which I was 17 going to hand up if there was a live hearing. I could 18 file it electronically if you need me to in order to 19 allow me to speak, but we obviously have an interest in 20 what happens today. 21 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Yes, you 22 can file that motion electronically. 23 MR. FALBY: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Let me say two things or address 25 two subjects and then hear what counsel have to say. The

two subjects are first how very unhappy I am this afternoon to have to be addressing this issue in this way. I'm going to expand on that in a moment, and second, what I understand to be the background issues in this case.

You won't be surprised to learn if you look at your own professional life that I don't usually sit around at my desk saying, oh, boy, I wish someone would file a motion for temporary restraining order so I would have something to do.

My entire day has been disrupted by this motion and I'm not happy about it. I just received from the defendants a phone-book sized submission about 15 minutes before I came in here. I've been able to read the memorandum.

This problem has been brewing, as far as I can see, since May and I am suddenly having to stop everything, including a lot of fairly important matters, and attempt to digest this stuff on the fly.

I also don't particularly like hearing people by telephone. For one thing, our mechanism is not very good and I'm having to speak about 150 percent louder than I normally speak. I can't gauge body language, facial expression or get any sense of what the relationship is amongst the parties because you're in various places in

1 || the country.

So at this point I'm in a plague on both your houses mood and pretty much inclined to put this all over until Monday and make everybody fly here and appear before me in person if this is so darn gone important that I have to stop what I'm doing and rule on it.

So I've now vented and hopefully I'll be able to relax and listen to what your arguments are, but as far as I'm concerned this is a heck of a way to run a railroad.

Of course, I know I will be hearing from each party in complete agreement with me and then saying, yes, but it's the other guy's fault that things are such a mess. That's not going to help me and I'm not particularly interested in that either. Here we are.

Now as I understand it, this is the background of the case, and I'm moving on to Roman Numeral II, the plaintiff is a distributor of a product which I'm going to call Trinity which belongs to the defendant Osiris.

Osiris is in the process of selling this particular asset to a third party named NuVasive. Blackstone has filed a motion for preliminary injunction in an attempt to block the sale.

The sale is scheduled to take place today or tomorrow and the plaintiff takes the position that

they're entitled to an immediate injunction from me barring the sale.

I have had an opportunity to read the submissions from the plaintiff and I've had an opportunity to read the submission from the defendant, which just hit my desk a few minutes ago. And when I say read the submission from the defendant, I mean the defendant's ten-page memorandum. There are a good deal of attachments which I have not had a chance to look at.

I guess I would like to begin by hearing from either Mr. Pucci or Mr. Hurst as to why we're here, and the reason that I ask that and you won't be surprised I suppose to hear me ask that because the point is made in the most recent submission from the defendant, paragraph 11.2 of the operative agreement seems to contemplate exactly what's happening here.

The provision says that "Osiris may transfer this agreement without prior written consent of distributor to an affiliate or in connection with a merger or sale of all, or substantially all, of the stock or assets of Osiris relating to this agreement."

Now defendant takes the position, in short, that what they propose to do is to transfer without prior written consent of the distributor all of the assets relating to this agreement, exactly what is contemplated

as permitted by the distributorship agreement, and I don't understand why I'm here to try to prevent the defendant from doing what the distributor agreement seems to say that they can do.

I also have representations from the defendant that it does not intend to do anything to interfere with Blackstone's rights under the agreement at least not prior to December 31, 2008, and I have a representation from NuVasive that it intends to respect all of plaintiff's rights as distributor through December 31st of 2008.

I also have a representation that Osiris does not have and, to the extent that it might have, has not disclosed any confidential information relating to Blackstone.

So I guess I'm wondering what the problem is and why I'm being asked to step in in a situation where at least my cursory reading of the agreement between the parties suggests in Article 11, Section 11.2 that this is exactly the type of transaction that their agreement recognizes and permits.

So, Mr. Hurst, could you address at least that subject first or Mr. Pucci, whichever one of you would like to speak. Just for the record, Mr. Pucci has just gestured toward the telephone, Mr. Hurst, so I think

you've got the laboring oar here. Perhaps you can enlighten me on that, and then you can add whatever I may be overlooking that you'd like to bring to my attention.

MR. HURST: I'll be glad to do so, Your Honor.

Before addressing Section 11.2, let me just say that while I've not had a chance to read the defendant's pleadings, none of the representations that Your Honor recited have been made to Blackstone over the last two months during which our chief executive officer has been in frequent communication with Mr. Mills of Osiris, Mr. Hannon of NuVasive, Mr. Lukianov, the CEO of NuVasive, in an attempt to understand how Osiris could possibly sell this business to a competitor of ours and honor the various covenants in our distribution agreement.

So there has very much been an effort on our part to gain this understanding. The only thing we've been told clearly by Osiris is we are going to close as soon as possible after our July 24th shareholder meeting, notwithstanding the fact that our agreement with NuVasive doesn't require us to close until September 8th. That is why we are here and unfortunately ruining your day, which I apologize.

As to Section 11.2 you are correct. I understand that facially that section does permit Osiris to assign its distribution agreement in connection with the sale of

the Osteocel business. That, however, is only one provision of the agreement.

Section 2.1 of the agreement under the heading appointment of distributor, second sentence from the bottom, says that "Osiris shall not enter into any agreement with any rights to a third party that would conflict with or violate the terms of this agreement."

THE COURT: Right. I did read that.

MR. HURST: The proposed sale to NuVasive, Your Honor, conflicts with this agreement in two ways certainly and in a third way possibly. The two certain ways it conflicts with this agreement is it destroys our right to exclusivity not only through the remainder of 2008 but into renewal terms.

Number two, Osiris has already told us in writing -this is in the July 7th letter which is attached to the
declaration of Michael Finegan -- that they will not
honor our right to renew beyond December 31, 2008.

The third way that this sale to NuVasive breaches the agreement is the risk of the disclosure of confidential information.

Now I won't sit here and tell the court, nor have we represented to the court, that we know for a fact confidential information has been disclosed. The assurance that was made to the court has never been made

to us and we believe that at a minimum additional time is required to allow us to explore that.

THE COURT: Let me just take those three points one by one.

You say, first of all, that this sale would destroy your rights to exclusivity not only through the end of December 31, 2008 but during any renewal period. Let's just focus now on through December 31, 2008.

If you had a representation from NuVasive that you would remain -- all of your rights, to the extent that they exist as an exclusive distributor, would be respected through December 31, 2008, and that's the representation that's been made to me by the defendants, then that would not be any difficulty for your client.

I'm going to hear from counsel for defendant here in a moment, but at least, unless I've misread their memorandum as I've gone through it hastily here, their position is we know you have this distributorship agreement. We are giving it to NuVasive and both NuVasive and Osiris have said it's yours. We're going to comply with it 100 percent. There's not going to be any change through December 2008.

So I've kind of got a swearing match right now, but I hear that you haven't heard those representations you say, but from where I'm sitting, you know, I suppose the

simplest thing for me to do is to say that I'm going to deny the motion for preliminary relief on condition that both the defendant Osiris and NuVasive upon pain of sanctions fully respect the distributorship agreement through December 31, 2008.

Would an order along those lines -- well, tuck into the back of your head the question whether an order along those lines would solve your problem.

The second issue having to do with the right to renew, there you do have a dog fight. I think it's perfectly clear that NuVasive intends to terminate your agreement after December 31, 2008. I think they feel that they have a right to do it.

They say that -- I don't know if you've had a chance to read this memo yet, but they say that the performance objectives which were supposed to be set forth in Exhibit D which would have provided the basis for renewal were never in fact created.

There is no Exhibit D, and all that the agreement in its present form contains is an agreement to possibly agree on a renewal and that's not binding and they don't intend to -- they don't intend to renew you. I think that's a pretty clear inference from the current situation.

What do you say about that? Are you entitled to be

renewed and is some order from me today going to protect that right to renewal? Those are my two questions right now.

MR. HURST: Your Honor, I think the most important thing that an order from you today can do is protect an arbitrator's right to decide if we have a right to renew with Osiris. We did not contract with NuVasive. We contracted with Osiris, the manufacturer of this product.

The right to arbitration that we contracted for will not be effective or a meaningful right if the toothpaste gets out of the tube and this deal goes forward and closes.

Your Honor, of course, you put your finger on the reason why the type of order you described a moment ago, while helpful, does not get us all the way there because there's five or six months left in 2008 and yet we have a right to renew this agreement and continue to be the exclusive distributor for years beyond that.

Your Honor is correct, I mean with our competitor sitting in the driver's seat, the landscape has simply changed and there is -- we just don't believe that an arbitrator will be able to fashion effective relief with NuVasive in the shoes of Osiris.

We think Osiris has entered into this agreement and

while it may pain them to postpone their closing with NuVasive, it is their obligation to honor the agreement and honor the dispute resolution proceedings.

THE COURT: What is the significance in your view of paragraph 11.2 then? Under your argument wouldn't subparagraph A of paragraph 11.2 lose all its meaning?

It says, again I hate to repeat it but I hope I'm reading it correctly, it says "Osiris may transfer this agreement without prior written consent of distributor to an affiliate or in connection with a merger or a sale of all, or substantially all, of the stock or assets of Osiris relating to this agreement."

Now the defendant says that is precisely what's happening. This is a sale of all or substantially all of the assets of Osiris relating to this agreement pure and simple.

We know at least, unless things move faster than typically, if I enter a preliminary order and I say go to arbitration, we can kiss this goodbye for at least a year or six months while you go through arbitration and pick an arbitrator. I imagine there may be a possibility of some kind of judicial review by the unhappy party of the arbitration.

Unless it's a very speedy arbitration, this whole

thing slides into the icebox for quite awhile and I think that's something that I have to consider in weighing the balance of harms here. But tell me what does that mean if it doesn't cover this situation? What does 11.2 Subsection A mean if it doesn't cover this situation? MR. HURST: What it means, Your Honor, is there's a whole universe of other biologic companies out there that are not out there selling spinal surgery products to surgeons in hospitals the way that Blackstone and NuVasive are in head-to-head competition. There are a whole universe of assignees to whom Osiris could have assigned this agreement without any objection on our part. While 11.2 says what it says, 2.1 also says what it says and there's clearly tension between them and we are right at the point of that tension, and an assignment to NuVasive simply cannot take place without breaching the

Osiris agreed it would not enter into any agreement or grant any rights to a third party re: NuVasive that would conflict with or violate the terms of the distribution agreement.

THE COURT: Okay.

distribution agreement.

MR. HURST: You've got to read it. You've got to -- I'm not saying you have to do anything.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: No, no, I know what you mean. The two have to be read together.

Let me hear from whoever would like to speak up now on behalf of the defendant here, whether it's Mr. Dillon or Ms. Azorsky or whichever one of you would like to jump in here.

MS. AZORSKY: This is Ms. Azorsky. Thank you, Your Honor.

I think that when you addressed this at the beginning you are exactly right, and I think if any order should enter, it should be exactly the order that you described.

There 11.2(a) allows a transfer of this agreement without even disclosure or without even prior written consent of the distributor and that it is exactly what's happening here.

It is being transferred and the reason that

Paragraph 2.1 doesn't conflict with that is because even
with that transfer, Blackstone will continue to get
everything it's entitled to get under this agreement.

I know you haven't had an opportunity to look at the declarations yet but we've summarized them in the memorandum and Osiris has stated that it intends to honor this agreement. NuVasive has stated that it intends to honor this agreement.

We have explained in Mr. Barns' declaration that the whole double counting concept that was put out there wouldn't be possible to honor the agreement if we transferred the business to NuVasive simply isn't true.

NuVasive is committed to continuing to give
Blackstone 80 percent of its product and the exclusivity
to which it's entitled through 2008.

There is a dispute about whether this agreement can be renewed at Blackstone's unilateral choice. We believe that they don't have a substantial likelihood of success on that argument.

Their argument is that this would continue for as long as they wanted it to continue and we would be their hostage until they decided they wanted out of this or developed some other product, and that's not what the agreement says. There are distinctive words. There is the use of the word shall and the use of the word may.

The only real dispute here is the extension. There is time to resolve that issue before the end of the year.

There has been no breach of the agreement. There is no anticipatory breach because everybody who's out there has said we have no intention to breach. We intend to honor this agreement.

THE COURT: So if I might summarize what you're saying, the transaction that is here on the wings is one

in which NuVasive will simply step into your client's shoes and take over the obligations in the agreement and has every intention of fully complying with that agreement?

MS. AZORSKY: That is correct, Your Honor, and if there is any dispute in the future, then NuVasive will have to honor whatever the entity that resolves that dispute says they have to do. There's just nothing in this agreement that says the distributor can stop Osiris from selling a whole business line.

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Falby or Mr. Hannon with regard to NuVasive. I have the same question with regard to NuVasive's intentions if they do -- if this transaction goes forward. Mr. Falby.

MR. FALBY: Yes, Your Honor. You've summarized it correctly that NuVasive will honor every obligation under the agreement.

My understanding of the primary complaint that Blackstone has is a compliant that my client intends itself to begin selling the product and distributing itself and competing as a distributor and destroying the exclusivity that belongs to Blackstone. That is not the case.

NuVasive is not -- NuVasive is not going to be distributing the product itself through the end of 2008.

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

As Mr. Hannon said in his affidavit today that's been filed with Your Honor, NuVasive will perform under the agreement all of its obligations assuming performance by Blackstone of its obligation.

It will perform entirely in accordance with the agreement including the exclusivity provision through the end of 2008 and this is not new news. This was announced in a press release that Mr. Hannon attaches to his affidavit that was issued in May when the transaction was announced.

So the answer to your question is, yes, we will comply and we agree wholeheartedly with Osiris that there has been no breach. There's no anticipatory breach, and there is no conflict between 11.2 and 2.1 because nothing that's happening here in any way affects or impinges or infringes any right that Blackstone has under this distribution agreement.

THE COURT: And I take it you would agree with Attorney Azorsky that there may be a disagreement that the parties have about what happens after December 31, 2008 when there is some type of consideration of renewal that's bound to come up.

MR. FALBY: Yes, we absolutely agree that there's a distribute about that and as to that there's obviously no exigency whatever because there's time to

decide that in arbitration where it belongs before the end of the year.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. FALBY: There's certainly no present dispute that needs resolution or that presents an issue or any emergency at this moment that could possibly support the issuance of injunctive relief.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Hurst, you've heard the representations of Attorney Azorsky and Attorney Falby. Do you have anything that you'd like to add?

MR. HURST: Two things, Your Honor. Although we've asked the question many times, this is the first, I hope, binding representation that our distribution agreement was going to be assigned to NuVasive.

When that question was put to NuVasive or Osiris before, it was met, more or less, with a shrug of the shoulders. We don't know; we'll have to wait and see.

Now Your Honor has already identified the logical inconsistency of NuVasive taking an assignment of this agreement and renewing it beyond 2008. Clearly they are setting themselves up to buy something that does not have the value they've assigned to it in their agreement, but if that is their representation that they're willing to abide with the decision that the agreement may be renewed beyond 2008, then that's great.

Now the other thing I would point out about that is our agreement to arbitrate is with Osiris. It is not until this distribution agreement is assigned to NuVasive that we have a right to arbitrate with them, and I would like to know if they are going to represent to the court that they will honor that arbitration agreement.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to put them in a position of where they have to respond to that. They can certainly respond if they want to but I don't need them to do that in order to put myself in a position where I can rule.

I do want to correct one thing because we may have heard the representations of Osiris and NuVasive differently. I think that the position of Osiris and NuVasive, perhaps I'm inferring something here, but I think it's a pretty clear inference that they take the position that they have the right to terminate the agreement as of December 31, 2008.

I think they think that the renewal provisions of the agreement are precatory or descriptive of something that the parties might voluntarily enter into, but I think they also take the position that the provisions do not bind them to renew.

I don't know who's right on that and I don't think I have to decide that right now. I don't know just how

I do not know whether your client will have a right to renew the agreement.

I think I can say that I'm probably not telling you anything when I think we can expect that both Osiris and NuVasive will take the position that they are not obligated to renew and they were not making any representation of any understanding that they had that they were obligated to renew.

It's a funny world. You never know what's going to happen and maybe everyone will get together and renewal will occur. We don't know, but I do know that there's nothing here before me right now that requires immediate action from the court.

So based upon the representations that I have just heard, I'm going to deny plaintiff's motion for temporary relief. It is on condition that if the sale goes forward, the purchaser will comply fully with the provisions of the applicable agreement through the end of December 2008, and I understand that that is fully the intention both of the seller Osiris here and of the third party NuVasive.

Based upon that I do not find that there is either any showing of likelihood of success on the merits or of irreparable harm. Of course, the First Circuit has made

it clear many times that the decision at this stage is merely an assessment of probabilities. That does not mean that as this case goes forward you won't be able to show that there was some actionable conduct and that you're entitled to damages.

All I'm finding is that there is no need for any immediate action by the court and for the reasons I just stated I'm going to decline to take any action and deny your motion.

So unless anyone has anything further to say, I'm prepared to recess right now. Okay.

MR. FALBY: Your Honor, this is Bruce Falby and I just want to make one point clear. I said it before that we intend fully to comply. Obviously if Blackstone begins not to comply by not taking the product or by not paying for it, we will act appropriately in the exercise of what rights that gives us under the agreement or what rights we have at law, but assuming full performance by them, we intend to fully perform and that's what Mr. Hannon's declaration says.

THE COURT: Right. Well, I don't think that the plaintiffs are suggesting that anything about this proceeding would give them a license to ignore any provisions of the agreement. I don't hear any suggestions that they have any such intention.

The agreement is what the agreement is and it will continue. Based upon what I've heard I understand that it will continue through at least December of 2008 and the plaintiff will suffer no immediate prejudice as a result of that, and all the parties will have a full opportunity to litigate the question of the extension as needed.

We don't even know yet whether there will be a renewal. I think it's the position of NuVasive that

there probably won't be but that decision still lies in

the future. If there's nothing further then --

MR. PUCCI: Nothing.

THE COURT: -- the court will be in recess.

Thank you all very much. Sorry for my grouchy comments at the beginning of the hearing. I appreciate your representations and that's where we will go. Thank you very much. Court's in recess.

(Court recessed at 2:47.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Alice Moran, Official Federal Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcription of my stenotype notes taken in the aforementioned matter to the best of my skill and ability.

/s/ Alice Moran
Alice Moran, CSR, RPR, RMR
Official Federal Court Reporter
1550 Main Street, Room 536
Springfield, MA 01103
(413) 731-0086
alice.moran@verizon.net